



Does exchange rate volatility matter for international sales? Evidence from US firm level data



Cengiz Tunç^{a,*}, M. Nihat Solakoglu^b

^a Research and Monetary Policy Department, Central Bank of the Republic of Turkey, Istiklal Cad. No:10, Ulus Ankara, 06100, Turkey

^b Bilkent University, Department of Banking and Finance, Bilkent, Ankara, 06800, Turkey

HIGHLIGHTS

- We analyze the effect of exchange rate volatility on firms' foreign sales.
- We use destination-specific US firm-level data and utilize quantile regression.
- The effect of the volatility on foreign sales depends on firm characteristics.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 20 February 2016

Received in revised form

17 June 2016

Accepted 2 August 2016

Available online 5 September 2016

JEL classification:

F14

F31

C21

Keywords:

Exchange rate volatility

Foreign sales

International trade

Quantile regression

ABSTRACT

We explore the effect of exchange rate volatility on firms' foreign sales using destination-specific US firm-level data at different quantiles of the conditional distribution. Results show that the sign and significance of the effect depend on the economic conditions, firm characteristics, the sector that the firms operate and the quantile of the conditional distribution. Hence, using aggregated data, utilizing mean-regression methods and ignoring firm-specific factors can explain the mixed results provided by the existing literature.

© 2016 Published by Elsevier B.V.

1. Introduction

The role of exchange rate volatility on firms' decisions to sell at home or abroad has been investigated many times in the past. Both theoretical and empirical works, however, have provided mixed results (e.g. Hooper and Kohlhagen, 1978; Cushman, 1986; Pozo, 1992; Assery and Peel, 1991). One reason, as argued in the literature, is the use of aggregated data which might mask the effect of exchange rate volatility on foreign sales (McKenzie, 1999; Huchet-Bourdon and Korinek, 2011; Tang, 2014; Wang and Barrett, 2007). Hence, one must look at the firm level data to understand the effect of exchange rate volatility on firms' decisions to sell in foreign

markets. Yet, there are few studies in the literature using firm-level data (Solakoglu et al., 2008; Solakoglu, 2010; Cheung and Sengupta, 2013; Guillou, 2008; Hericourt and Poncet, forthcoming; Dekle and Ryoo, 2007; Gourlay and Seaton, 2004).

In this study, we explore the relationship between exchange rate volatility and firms' foreign sales, taking into account several firm-specific characteristics and using destination-specific foreign sales data for US firms. In addition, we apply the Regression Quantile estimation developed by Koenker and Bassett (1978) to evaluate the effect at different points of the conditional distribution. We show that the sign and significance of exchange rate volatility on firms' foreign sales differs based on economic conditions, the sector in which the firm operates, and firm characteristics. Moreover, the effect is not stable across all quantiles of the conditional distribution.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 discusses the data and model specification. Section 3 presents the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: cengiz.tunc@tcmb.gov.tr (C. Tunç), nsolakoglu@bilkent.edu.tr (M.N. Solakoglu).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2016.08.008>

0165-1765/© 2016 Published by Elsevier B.V.

estimation results as well as a discussion of these results. Finally, the last section presents our main conclusions.

2. Model specification and implementation

Our sample covers firms located in the US listed in the S&P400, S&P500, or S&P600, with positive foreign sales in 2006 and 2008, thus representing a non-crisis and crisis period. Destination markets are the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Canada, Japan, China, Brazil, Mexico, and Singapore. All firm level data are obtained from Thomson Reuters Worldscope database; other variables except for exchange rates are taken from the World Bank database. Exchange rate volatility is estimated as the standard deviation of exchange rate returns over the previous 12 months compared to the relevant month. As a check of robustness, we also calculated a GARCH-based measure using weekly exchange rate returns obtained from Datastream database.

Descriptive statistics, provided in Table 1, reveal that the share of foreign sales, foreign-market dependence, and the size of foreign sales increased from 2006 to 2008. This should not be surprising, as 2008 represents the beginning of crisis years that originated from the United States. Moreover, the share of foreign sales is larger for “Information Technology” and smaller in “Industrials” than for other sectors in both periods. A possible reason is that the US is technologically one of the most advanced countries, with high R&D intensity and vast exports of high-tech products such as aerospace, computers, pharmaceuticals, scientific instruments, and electrical machinery. Further, the percentage of firms that has a higher dependence on foreign sales – that is, the level of foreign sales is greater than the median – is higher in “Consumer Discretionary”. Interestingly, even though the “Information Technology” sector has a higher share of foreign sales, the percent of firms that depend on foreign market is smaller and the average of foreign sales is smaller than the overall average.

As suggested in the literature, we expect a negative relationship between exchange rate volatility and the share of foreign sales. However, we also expect firm size, foreign-market dependence, and the sector in which the firm operates to be important. In particular, we expect larger and more foreign market dependent firms to be affected less by higher volatility as they should have resources and incentives to hedge against such risks.

Using the Regression Quantile (RQ) approach, the θ th Regression Quantile is a vector $\beta(\theta)$ that solves the following minimization problem with linear programming:

$$\min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^k} \left[\sum_{i \in \{i: y_i \geq x'_{i,t} \beta\}} \theta |\log(\text{share})_{i,j,t} - x'_{i,j,t} \beta| + \sum_{i \in \{i: y_i < x'_{i,t} \beta\}} (1 - \theta) |\log(\text{share})_{i,j,t} - x'_{i,j,t} \beta| \right] \quad (1)$$

where $x'_{i,j,t} \beta$ is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} x'_{i,j,t} \beta = & \alpha + \beta_1 \log(\text{GDP})_{j,t} + \beta_2 \log(\text{RCPI})_{j,t} \\ & + \beta_3 \log(\text{Exrate})_{j,t} + \beta_4 \log(\text{Volatility})_{j,t} \\ & + \beta_5 [\log(\text{Volatility})_{j,t} \times \text{sector1}] \\ & + \beta_6 [\log(\text{Volatility})_{j,t} \times \text{sector2}] \\ & + \beta_7 [\log(\text{Volatility})_{j,t} \times \text{sector3}] \\ & + \beta_8 [\log(\text{Volatility})_{j,t} \times \text{size}] \\ & + \beta_9 [\log(\text{Volatility})_{j,t} \times \text{dependence}_{j,t}]. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The dependent variable is firm i 's share of foreign sales for the foreign market j at time t , in logs. The variable GDP is the gross domestic product in constant 2000 US dollars of the destination market at time t . RCPI represents the relative prices and is calculated as the ratio of the consumer price index in the destination market to that in the US. Exrate is the bilateral exchange rate expressed as the price of one US dollar in terms of the destination currency. The exchange rate risk is denoted by the variable “volatility”. For firm-specific characteristics, we use industry, size, and dependency on foreign sales. For industry dummies, we focus on “Consumer Discretionary”, “Industrials”, and “Information Technology”, gathering other industries together. Size is a dummy variable that identifies smaller firms if they are listed in the S&P400 or S&P600. Foreign-market dependence is indicated by the dummy variable “dependence” in the equation.

3. Results and discussion

Estimation results for 2006, reported in Table 2, reveal that exchange rate risk has a significant and negative effect on the share of foreign sales for large firms that do not depend on foreign sales and operate in other sectors (as represented by β_4). Moreover, this finding is stable across all quantiles of the conditional distribution, which is consistent with the mean regression result. However, the quantile regression estimation conveys a different result than the mean regression estimation for firms operating in the information technology sector: that is, only firms located at the left tail of the distribution lower their share of foreign sales due to higher volatility. A similar result is observed for firms in the industrials and consumer discretionary sectors. Firms located at the far left tail appear to be more sensitive to exchange rate risk.

Contrary to our expectation, we do not find a smaller (larger) impact of exchange rate volatility on foreign sales for larger (smaller) firms. In fact, there is some evidence that smaller firms actually use higher volatility to their advantage, as the sign of the coefficient for smaller firms ($\beta_4 + \beta_8$) is positive and significant in the left tail of the conditional distribution. Our sample in 2006 indicates that 79% of smaller firms and 26% of larger firms are dependent on foreign sales, implying that smaller firms also have incentives to hedge. With the GARCH-based volatility measure, we have a positive and significant effect at the right tail of the conditional distribution as well.¹ According to mean regression estimation, while firm size is statistically insignificant ($\beta_4 + \beta_8$) with the first volatility measure, the coefficient becomes significant with the GARCH-based measure. Furthermore, with the GARCH-based measure, we find that foreign-sale dependent firms are positively impacted by higher volatility across almost the entire conditional distribution.

Similarly, the estimation results for 2008, provided in Table 3, reveal that exchange rate volatility has a negative impact on firms' foreign sales if the firms operate in other sectors, are larger in size, and depend less on foreign sales. Comparing the 2008 results to those of 2006, we see that the sectoral effect becomes irrelevant under a crisis environment. All firms are affected negatively by higher exchange rate volatility. Nevertheless, our findings differ for smaller firms and also for firms that depend more on foreign sales. For these firms, we find that the share of foreign sales responds negatively and significantly to exchange rate volatility at the right tail of the conditional distribution. At the left tail of the conditional distribution, neither for smaller firms nor for firms that depend more on foreign sales do we find an effect of exchange rate volatility on the share of foreign sales. In sum, our results show

¹ To save space, we do not report estimation results with GARCH-based measure but only discuss the differences.

Table 1
Descriptive statistics.

Industry	Share of foreign sales	Firm size	Foreign market dependence	Foreign sales	# of Obs
Year = 2006					
Consumer Discretionary	7.88	51.78	57.14	1028.28	56
Industrials	7.52	73.94	42.85	294.83	119
Information Technology	13.81	74.28	35.23	443.08	105
All other industries	9.92	52.63	50.00	676.21	152
All industries	9.94	63.67	45.37	604.29	432
Year = 2008					
Consumer Discretionary	9.56	49.31	65.75	1077.90	73
Industrials	8.07	73.98	50.41	360.83	123
Information Technology	14.03	64.02	41.72	447.76	139
All other industries	9.78	53.41	57.14	886.25	161
All industries	10.52	60.89	52.42	661.28	496

Firms size reports the percent of firms listed under S&P400 and S&P600. Total number of firms also include S&P500.

Hence, this ratio indicates % of smaller firms. Foreign market dependence is the % of firms with level of foreign sales above the median. Foreign sales is the average value of foreign sales' in millions USD. Share of foreign sales provide the average ratio of foreign sales to total sales for each industry.

All other industries include: consumer staples, energy, health care, materials' telecommunication services, and utilities.

Table 2
Effect of exchange rate volatility on share of foreign sales: 2006.

	Mean regression	Quantiles								
		Q10	Q20	Q30	Q40	Q50	Q60	Q70	Q80	Q90
Economic activity (β_1)	0.1938*** (0.0738)	0.4788*** (0.1524)	0.3140*** (0.0970)	0.2964*** (0.0990)	0.2647*** (0.0926)	0.2341*** (0.0816)	0.1318 (0.0808)	0.1524* (0.0799)	0.1065 (0.0974)	0.0938 (0.0977)
Relative price (β_2)	-16.4855*** (6.0682)	-13.9767*** (12.5205)	-13.3116 (7.9675)	-17.9691** (8.1335)	-22.0899*** (7.6108)	-14.7901** (6.7016)	-11.0280* (6.6362)	-10.9732 (6.5615)	-13.6426* (8.0069)	-13.6426* (8.0264)
Exchange rate (β_3)	-0.0671* (0.0343)	-0.1368* (0.0707)	-0.1335*** (0.0450)	-0.1068** (0.0460)	-0.0734* (0.0430)	-0.0788** (0.0379)	-0.0348 (0.0375)	-0.0326 (0.0371)	-0.0295 (0.0452)	-0.0306 (0.0454)
ER volatility (β_4)	-0.3571* (0.1917)	-0.6881* (0.3956)	-0.8728*** (0.2517)	-1.2002*** (0.2570)	-0.7630*** (0.2405)	-0.7284*** (0.2117)	-0.6116*** (0.2097)	-0.5535*** (0.2073)	-0.4133 (0.2530)	-0.7843*** (0.2536)
ER Volatility * sector1 (β_5)	-0.4637*** (0.1537)	-0.5802* (0.3171)	-0.4626** (0.2018)	-0.3708* (0.2060)	-0.4726** (0.1927)	-0.3817** (0.1697)	-0.2238 (0.1681)	-0.1774 (0.1662)	-0.2350 (0.2028)	-0.1937 (0.2033)
ER Volatility * sector2 (β_6)	-0.1884 (0.1776)	-0.7998** (0.3665)	-0.3358 (0.2332)	-0.1900 (0.2381)	-0.2546 (0.2228)	-0.2136 (0.1962)	-0.2750 (0.1943)	-0.2353 (0.1921)	-0.2133 (0.2344)	-0.3145 (0.2349)
ER Volatility * sector3 (β_7)	-0.4017* (0.2161)	-0.8753* (0.4459)	-0.5802* (0.2837)	-0.3579 (0.2897)	-0.3321 (0.2710)	-0.3327 (0.2387)	-0.3271 (0.2363)	-0.2048 (0.2337)	-0.2068 (0.2851)	0.1815 (0.2858)
ER Volatility * size (β_8)	0.5610*** (0.1562)	1.2776*** (0.3224)	1.2046*** (0.2051)	1.4263*** (0.2094)	1.1343*** (0.1960)	0.9150*** (0.1725)	0.7069*** (0.1709)	0.5212*** (0.1689)	0.4067*** (0.2061)	0.4095*** (0.2067)
ER Volatility * fsales1 (β_9)	0.4694*** (0.1477)	1.2102*** (0.3048)	1.1022*** (0.1940)	1.2480*** (0.1980)	0.8926*** (0.1853)	0.8659*** (0.1632)	0.6337*** (0.1616)	0.5589*** (0.1598)	0.3377* (0.1949)	0.4920* (0.1954)
(a) $\beta_4 + \beta_5$	-0.8209***	-1.2683***	-1.3354***	-1.5710***	-1.2357***	-1.1102***	-0.8354***	-0.7308***	-0.6482***	-0.9780***
(b) $\beta_4 + \beta_6$	-0.5455***	-1.4879***	-1.2085***	-1.3902***	-1.0176***	-0.9420***	-0.8866***	-0.7888***	-0.6265***	-1.0988***
(c) $\beta_4 + \beta_7$	-0.7589***	-1.5634***	-1.4530***	-1.5581***	-1.0951***	-1.0611***	-0.9387***	-0.7583***	-0.6200***	-0.6028***
(d) $\beta_4 + \beta_8$	0.2039	0.5895**	0.3318	0.2262	0.3713**	0.1865	0.0953	-0.0323	-0.0065	-0.3747**
(e) $\beta_4 + \beta_9$	0.1123	0.5221*	0.2295	0.0479	0.1296	0.1375	0.0221	0.0055	-0.0755	-0.2923
Pseudo R^2	0.0941	0.1081	0.0939	0.0849	0.0818	0.0826	0.0699	0.0569	0.0426	0.0626

Standard errors are provided in parentheses.

Economic activity is represented by the real GDP of the foreign country (constant 2000 US dollars). Relative price is measured as the ratio of foreign price level relative to US. Exchange rate is the price of US dollar in terms of foreign currency. Hence, an increase in exchange rates indicates US dollar appreciation. Exchange rate volatility is measured with the standard deviation of exchange rate returns.

Pseudo $R^2 = 1 - [V_1/V_0]$ where V_1 is the function value at the minimum, and V_0 is the minimized function value for the constrained problem when all slope coefficients are constrained to be zero.

* Represent statistical significance at 10% level.

** Represent statistical significance at 5% level.

*** Represent statistical significance at 1% level.

that sectoral differences become insignificant under a recessionary environment, while firm size and foreign-market dependence become important factors that determine the sensitivity of the foreign sales share to exchange rate volatility, but only at the right tail of the distribution. With the GARCH-based measure, there are slight differences: firm size becomes irrelevant at the right tail and foreign-market dependence becomes irrelevant at the left-tail of the conditional distribution. Although there are some small differences, the effect of exchange rate volatility on the shares of foreign sales stays qualitatively the same with both measures of volatility.

If both domestic and foreign sales decline because of higher exchange rate volatility, the share of foreign sales will not change significantly and hence our results may indicate no relationship.² For that reason, we estimated Eq. (2) with the level of foreign sales, in logs, as the dependent variable. Only partial results are provided in Table 4 to save space. For both years, we find that exchange rate volatility causes the level of foreign sales to decline at the

² We would like to thank an anonymous referee for this comment that improved the paper considerably.

Table 3

Effect of exchange rate volatility on share of foreign sales: 2008.

	Mean regression	Quantiles								
		Q 10	Q 20	Q 30	Q 40	Q 50	Q 60	Q 70	Q 80	Q 90
Economic activity (β_1)	0.2252*** (0.0619)	0.3282** (0.1390)	0.2078** (0.0960)	0.1474* (0.0813)	0.1954*** (0.0758)	0.1933*** (0.0752)	0.2047*** (0.0716)	0.1174* (0.0641)	0.1392** (0.0624)	0.2159** (0.0973)
Relative price (β_2)	0.5319 (1.3548)	−2.7968 (3.0397)	1.3775 (2.0998)	0.5649 (1.7775)	0.8880 (1.6583)	0.0506 (1.6442)	1.5007 (1.5665)	2.3102* (1.4022)	1.8488 (1.3639)	2.0621 (2.1279)
Exchange rate (β_3)	0.0134 (0.0284)	−0.0428 (0.0637)	0.0098 (0.0440)	0.0031 (0.0373)	0.0071 (0.0348)	0.0127 (0.0345)	0.0209 (0.0328)	0.0554* (0.0294)	0.0482* (0.0286)	0.0133 (0.0446)
ER volatility (β_4)	−0.7908*** (0.1020)	−0.6337*** (0.2289)	−0.8540*** (0.1581)	−0.8874*** (0.1339)	−0.7903*** (0.1249)	−0.8856*** (0.1238)	−0.7782*** (0.1180)	−0.8502*** (0.1056)	−0.8488*** (0.1027)	−0.9373*** (0.1602)
ER Volatility * sector 1 (β_5)	−0.0912 (0.0872)	−0.1624 (0.1956)	−0.0190 (0.1351)	0.0857 (0.1144)	−0.0041 (0.1067)	0.0074 (0.1058)	−0.0259 (0.1008)	−0.0132 (0.0902)	0.0326 (0.0877)	0.0065 (0.1369)
ER Volatility * sector 2 (β_6)	−0.1108 (0.0782)	−0.0364 (0.1755)	−0.1814 (0.1212)	−0.1511 (0.1026)	−0.1640* (0.0957)	−0.1645* (0.0949)	−0.1275 (0.0904)	−0.0876 (0.0809)	−0.0221 (0.0787)	−0.1397 (0.1228)
ER Volatility * sector 3 (β_7)	−0.1570* (0.0939)	−0.3365 (0.2108)	−0.0951 (0.1456)	−0.0688 (0.1233)	−0.0025 (0.1150)	−0.0397 (0.1140)	−0.0939 (0.1086)	−0.1639* (0.0972)	−0.1314 (0.0946)	−0.2164 (0.1476)
ER Volatility * size (β_8)	0.5129*** (0.0720)	0.6640*** (0.1615)	0.8158*** (0.1116)	0.7081*** (0.0945)	0.5527*** (0.0881)	0.4947*** (0.0874)	0.4424*** (0.0832)	0.3963*** (0.0745)	0.3278*** (0.0725)	0.3562*** (0.1131)
ER Volatility * fsales1 (β_9)	0.5934*** (0.0708)	0.7019*** (0.1588)	0.7489*** (0.1097)	0.7414*** (0.0929)	0.6033*** (0.0866)	0.6044*** (0.0859)	0.5206*** (0.0819)	0.4736*** (0.0733)	0.4371*** (0.0713)	0.5122*** (0.1112)
(a) $\beta_4 + \beta_5$	−0.8820***	−0.7962***	−0.8730***	−0.8017***	−0.7945***	−0.8782***	−0.8041***	−0.8633***	−0.8162***	−0.9308***
(b) $\beta_4 + \beta_6$	−0.9016***	−0.6702***	−1.0354***	−1.0385***	−0.9544***	−1.0501***	−0.9057***	−0.9378***	−0.8709***	−1.0770***
(c) $\beta_4 + \beta_7$	−0.9478***	−0.9702***	−0.9491***	−0.9562***	−0.7929***	−0.9253***	−0.8721***	−1.0141***	−0.9802***	−1.1538***
(d) $\beta_4 + \beta_8$	−0.2779***	0.0303	−0.0382	−0.1793	−0.2376***	−0.3908***	−0.3358***	−0.4538***	−0.5209***	−0.5811***
(e) $\beta_4 + \beta_9$	−0.1973***	0.0682	−0.1051	−0.1460	−0.1870***	−0.2811***	−0.2576***	−0.3765***	−0.4116***	−0.4251***
Pseudo R ²	0.2195	0.1460	0.1221	0.1172	0.1222	0.1317	0.1242	0.1310	0.1522	0.1852

Standard errors are provided in parentheses.

Economic activity is represented by the real GDP of the foreign country (constant 2000 US dollars). Relative price is measured as the ratio of foreign price level relative to US. Exchange rate is the price of US dollar in terms of foreign currency. Hence, an increase in exchange rates indicates US dollar appreciation. Exchange rate volatility is measured with the standard deviation of exchange rate returns.

Pseudo R² = 1 − [V₁/V₀] where V₁ is the function value at the minimum, and V₀ is the minimized function value for the constrained problem when all slope coefficients are constrained to be zero.

* Represent statistical significance at 10% level.

** Represent statistical significance at 5% level.

*** Represent statistical significance at 1% level.

Table 4

Effect of exchange rate volatility on level of foreign sales.

	Mean regression	Quantiles								
		Q 10	Q 20	Q 30	Q 40	Q 50	Q 60	Q 70	Q 80	Q 90
Year = 2006										
ER volatility (β_4)	−0.9452	1.2261	2.0605**	1.1251	1.2758	−3.0004***	−4.5484***	−5.2900***	−6.7006***	−9.0413***
ER Volatility * sector 1 (β_5)	−0.6526	−0.2934	−0.6882	−0.1269	−0.0814	−0.3717	0.0537	−0.2291	0.0947	−0.0104
ER Volatility * sector2 (β_6)	−0.0871	1.0881	−0.4921	0.6359	0.6965	0.1104	0.6361	−0.0171	−0.5101	−0.3537
ER Volatility * sector3 (β_7)	0.0474	−1.4624	−0.9558	0.6975	0.3014	0.4261	0.2992	0.1639	1.1856	2.3170*
ER Volatility * size (β_8)	−0.2964	−1.1978	−1.6907**	−1.7167**	−1.9217**	−1.4313	−0.9730	−0.9500	−0.6757	−0.6471
ER Volatility * fsales1 (β_9)	2.8011***	8.0667***	6.5434***	5.6722***	4.9737***	4.7693***	5.3546***	6.6111***	7.5604***	8.7657***
Year = 2008										
ER volatility (β_4)	−1.0683***	−0.5717	−0.3115	−0.2654	−0.7136	−1.4206***	−1.4238***	−1.8513***	−1.8280***	−3.0821***
ER Volatility * sector 1 (β_5)	−0.4388	−0.3314	−0.6546	−0.5812	−0.1836	−0.3138	−0.2562	−0.2087	0.0350	−0.3195
ER Volatility * sector2 (β_6)	0.3219	0.5798	0.3517	0.3216	0.3713	0.4164	0.4074*	0.3273	0.2475	−0.1516
ER Volatility * sector3 (β_7)	−0.0854	−0.4888	−0.0422	0.0304	−0.1648	−0.2500	−0.3729	−0.2512	−0.2328	0.6904
ER Volatility * size (β_8)	−1.4048***	−0.6515	−1.0567***	−1.2534***	−1.4972***	−1.4273***	−1.4342***	−1.4342***	−1.5908***	−1.0239***
ER Volatility * fsales1 (β_9)	3.7139***	4.2975***	3.7986***	3.6387***	3.3922***	3.4549***	3.4936***	3.5699***	3.9741***	4.2845***

* Represent statistical significance at 10% level.

** Represent statistical significance at 5% level.

*** Represent statistical significance at 1% level.

right tail of the conditional distribution for large firms that do not depend on foreign sales and operate in other sectors. Neither for 2006 nor for 2008 do we find any sectoral effect. Different from reported results, we now find evidence that smaller firms are more negatively influenced by higher volatility. Moreover, while this effect is significant only at the lower quantiles for 2006, it is significant across all quantiles in 2008. This finding indicates that both domestic and foreign sales decline for smaller firms under higher volatility, but that the decline appears to be larger in the domestic market.

4. Concluding remarks

This study investigates the effect of exchange rate volatility on firms' foreign sales, using destination-specific US firm level data and taking into account several firm characteristics. We show that the effect of exchange rate volatility on firms' foreign sales is influenced by the sector in which the firms operate, by firm size, and by foreign-market dependence. Moreover, the effect changes across different quantiles of the conditional distribution. The results are qualitatively the same under two different measures of

volatility. In addition, we show that the responses of the shares of foreign sales and the level of foreign sales to exchange rates are different, in particular for smaller firms. In sum, our analysis shows that the sign and significance of the effect of exchange rate volatility on foreign sales should be analyzed at the firm level, taking into account firm-specific characteristics and the conditional distribution.

References

- Assery, A., Peel, D., 1991. The effects of exchange rate volatility on exports: Some new estimates. *Econom. Lett.* 37, 173–177.
- Cheung, Y., Sengupta, R., 2013. Impact of exchange rate movements on exports: An analysis of indian non-financial sector firms. *J. Int. Money Finance* 39, 231–245.
- Cushman, D., 1986. Has exchange risk depressed international trade? The impact of third country exchange risk. *J. Int. Money Finance* 5, 361–378.
- Dekle, R., Ryoo, H., 2007. Exchange rate fluctuations, financing constraints, hedging, and exports: Evidence from firm level data. *J. Int. Financ. Mark. Inst. Money* 17, 437–451.
- Gourlay, A., Seaton, J., 2004. UK export behavior at the firm level. *Econ. Issues* 9, 3–20.
- Guillou, S., 2008. Export and Exchange Rate Volatility: A Firm Level Investigation. OFCE Working Paper 2008–2.
- Hericourt, J., Poncet, S., 2013. Exchange rate volatility, financial constraints and trade: Empirical evidence from Chinese firms. *World Bank Econ. Rev.* 27, (forthcoming).
- Hooper, P., Kohlhagen, S., 1978. The effect of exchange rate uncertainty on the prices and volume of international trade. *J. Int. Econ.* 8, 483–511.
- Huchet-Bourdon, M., Korinek, J., 2011. To What Extent Do Exchange Rates and their Volatility Affect Trade? OECD Trade Policy Paper 119.
- Koenker, R., Bassett Jr., G., 1978. Regression quantiles. *Econometrica* 46, 33–50.
- McKenzie, M., 1999. The impact of exchange rate volatility on international trade flows. *J. Econ. Surv.* 13, 71–106.
- Pozo, S., 1992. Conditional exchange rate volatility and the volume of international trade: Evidence from the early 1900s. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 74, 325–329.
- Solakoglu, M.N., 2010. Exchange rate exposure and real exports. *Appl. Econ. Lett.* 17, 457–462.
- Solakoglu, M., Solakoglu, E., Demirag, T., 2008. Exchange rate volatility and exports: A firm-level analysis. *Appl. Econ.* 40, 921–929.
- Tang, H., 2014. Exchange rate volatility and Intra-Asia trade: Evidence by type of goods. *World Econ.* 37, 335–352.
- Wang, K., Barrett, C.B., 2007. Estimating the effects of exchange rate volatility on export volume. *J. Agric. Resour. Econ.* 32, 225–255.